



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

it is an implied condition of incorporation that bankruptcy shall revoke the charter. But it is not likely that state legislatures would make the existence of corporations, their own creations, depend upon federal proceedings. As has been suggested, the bankruptcy laws are aimed not at the life of the debtor, but solely at his assets. See *Holland v. Hayman*, 60 Ga. 174. Possession of assets is not requisite to a corporation's existence, hence the implication of dissolution is not based on necessity. There are, moreover, obvious advantages in the continuation of a corporation which is subject to liabilities. The decision of the present case, therefore, seems correct.

**DAMAGES — MEASURE OF DAMAGES — INTEREST UPON DEMURRAGE.** — *Held*, that interest is not recoverable upon demurrage awarded to a vessel for the time she was laid up for repairs after an injury by collision. *The Sitka*, 156 Fed. 427 (Dist. Ct., W. D. N. Y.).

When a vessel is detained for repairs after a collision the owner may recover full compensation in the nature of demurrage for the loss sustained by the detention. *The Potomac*, 105 U. S. 630. The law as to interest upon such demurrage is entirely unsettled. Of the few cases which give any consideration to the question the majority either allow it or leave it to the discretion of the jury. *The America*, 11 Blatchf. (U. S.) 485. On general principles, when a tort has deprived the plaintiff of property, interest is due on the claim from the date when the defendant should have reimbursed the plaintiff. *Clark v. Miller*, 54 N. Y. 528. Interest, therefore, is recoverable upon the cost of repairs from the time the bill became payable. *The Mahanoy*, 127 Fed. 773. But the date upon which the profits of a vessel would be receivable varies in every case and it is impossible to establish any general principle, as in the case of repairs. Although unscientific, it seems to work substantial justice to leave the question to the discretion of the jury with instructions to fully compensate the libellant for the detention. SPENCER, MARINE COLLISIONS, § 206.

**DAMAGES — MEASURE OF DAMAGES — RECOVERY FOR SUBSIDENCE OF SOIL DUE TO WITHDRAWAL OF SUPPORT.** — The plaintiffs sought compensation for damages to cotton mills resulting from subsidence caused by the past working of mines. *Held*, that the depreciation in selling value due to fear of further subsidence cannot be taken into account in estimating damages. *West Leigh Colliery Co. v. Tunncliffe and Hampson*, [1908] A. C. 27.

It is well settled in England that the cause of action in cases of subsidence of the soil caused by working of mines is not the withdrawal of support, but the subsidence itself. See 13 HARV. L. REV. 665. The proper measure of damages in such cases is the depreciation in the market value of the premises due to the wrongful act of the defendant. *Hosking v. Phillips*, 3 Exch. 168. Damage to be caused by possible future subsidence cannot be taken into account in assessing damages for past subsidence, but all damage caused by a single subsidence must be claimed in a single action. *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell*, 11 App. Cas. 127. To allow for present diminution of selling value of an estate arising from fear of further subsidence is, however, not open to the objection that it allows present damages for a future cause of action. But the present decision may well be supported on the ground that such damage is only remotely, and not in a legal sense, caused by the subsidence and is in fact due to the removal of support, which, though it is a present cause, is not a wrongful act. *Rust v. Victoria Graving Dock Co.*, 36 Ch. D. 113.

**DEDICATION — RESTRICTIONS ON DEDICATION — RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED BY DEDICATOR.** — An owner dedicated land to the public for use as a street on the conditions that it should be graded, and that the abutting property owners should be free from assessment therefor or for other street improvements. The defendant municipality accepted it on behalf of the public subject to these conditions. It graded the street and assessed the abutting property owners for the cost. The plaintiff brought a writ of *certiorari* to test the validity of the assessment. *Held*, that the assessment be set aside. *Perth Amboy Trust Co. v. Perth Amboy*, 68 Atl. 84 (N. J., Sup. Ct.). See NOTES, p. 356.